

2. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 1 in which the subject is caused to inhale the substance into the airways of [the] a lung.

B1
3. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 1 in which the subject is caused to inhale the substance into [the airways of the nose] a nasal airway.

8. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 1 in which the proportion of the particles [in the respirable range] having a respirable size is at least 10% by weight of the substance, preferably at least 25%, more preferably at least 40% and most preferably at least 50%.

B2
Sub C2
9. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 1 in which the parameter indicative of airway narrowing that is measured comprises measuring the amount of forced expiratory volume in [1] one second [(FEV₁)].

Sub C3
B3
12. (Amended) A method for increasing mucociliary clearance or inducing sputum comprising the step of causing a subject to inhale into [his or her] subject's airways an effective amount of a substance capable of altering the osmolarity of airway surface liquid, the substance being in the form of a dispersible dry powder containing an effective proportion of particles of a respirable size.

27²

13. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 12 in which the subject is caused to inhale the substance into the airways of [the] a lung.

B3
14. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 12 in which the subject is caused to inhale the substance into [the airways of the nose] a nasal airway.

B4
19. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 12 in which the proportion of the particles [in the respirable range] having a respirable size is at least 10% by weight of the substance, preferably at least 25%, more preferably at least 40% and most preferably at least 50%.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified amendment is herewith requested in view of the above-identified amendments and in view of the following arguments.

Claims 1-3, 8-9, 12-14 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regarded as the invention.

More specifically, in claims 1-3, 8-9, 12-14 and 19, the Examiner pointed to various phrases that he believed did not have proper antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended all of these claims to remove most of the problems